UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE                        | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.        | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| 10/821,323  | 04/09/2004                         | Yosuke Hosoya        | 09792909-5853              | 9692             |
|   | 7590 10/15/200<br>EIN NATH & ROSEN | EXAMINER             |                            |                  |
| P.O. BOX 061080   |                                    |                      | ECHELMEYER, ALIX ELIZABETH |                  |
| WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER<br>CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080 |                                    | STOWER               | ART UNIT                   | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |                                    | 1795                 |                            |                  |
|   |                                    |                      |                            |                  |
|   |                                    | MAIL DATE            | DELIVERY MODE              |                  |
|   |                                    |                      | 10/15/2008                 | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)  |  |
|-----------------|---------------|--|
| 10/821,323      | HOSOYA ET AL. |  |
|                 |               |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit      |  |

|   | nx Enzaseth Echenneyer  | 17 50   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears  | s on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence addre   | ess   |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>30 September 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A  | APPLICATION IN CONDITION F  | OR ALLOWANCE.   |   |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the application, applicant must timely file one of the following rep application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFF periods:  | olies: (1) an amendment, affidavit<br>(with appeal fee) in compliance v   | , or other evidence, wh<br>with 37 CFR 41.31; or (  | ich places the<br>3) a Request                        |
| <ul> <li>a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing da</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisor no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later</li> </ul>   | sory Action, or (2) the date set forth i  |   |   |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shot set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 sion and the corresponding amount or tened statutory period for reply origin | FIRST REPLY WAS FILE<br>36(a) and the appropriate<br>of the fee. The appropriate<br>nally set in the final Office | extension fee<br>e extension fee<br>action; or (2) as |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL  |   |   |   |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliar filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within AMENDMENTS   | on thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to  | avoid dismissal of the  |   |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consic  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  | deration and/or search (see NOT   | E below);   |   |
| <ul> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corr</li> </ul>  |   |   | e issues for  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  |   |   |   |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121.  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):   | ·   |   |   |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow  | able if submitted in a separate, t  | imely filed amendment   | canceling the   |
| non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1-7.   |   | be entered and an exp   | olanation of  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |   |   |   |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and so was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   |   |   |   |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a N entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary ar   | rcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea<br>nd was not earlier presented.  Se  | ll and/or appellant fails<br>ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).   | to provide a  |
| 10.   | f the status of the claims after er   | itry is below or attached   | d.  |
| 11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but do   | oes NOT place the application in  | condition for allowance   | e because:  |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PT 13. Other: The claims raise new issues that require further consamendment, since claims 2 and 4 depended only from claim 1 and 1 by the after final amendment. Additionally, the amendment to clathe cubic system was not previously considered with the limitations   | sideration. The scope of claims 2<br>I thus did not require the limitatio<br>iim 5 raises new issues because                                  | ns of claim 3 that were   | added to claim  |
| /SUSY N TSANG-FOSTER/   |   |   |   |

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795

## Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.
Part of Paper No. 20081009